UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/550,891	09/27/2005	Mitsuaki Hata	Q90575	3716
23373 SUGHRUE MI	7590 03/23/200 ON, PLLC	EXAMINER		
2100 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, N.W. SUITE 800 WASHINGTON, DC 20037			JOLLEY, KIRSTEN	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1792	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			03/23/2009	PAPER

## Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Office Action Commons	10/550,891	HATA, MITSUAKI			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Kirsten C. Jolley	1792			
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).					
Status					
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on					
	_				
,	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·				
closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
closed in accordance with the practice under Lx parte Quayre, 1935 C.D. 11, 405 C.C. 215.					
Disposition of Claims					
<ul> <li>4)  Claim(s) 1-11 is/are pending in the application.</li> <li>4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.</li> <li>5)  Claim(s) is/are allowed.</li> <li>6)  Claim(s) 1-11 is/are rejected.</li> <li>7)  Claim(s) is/are objected to.</li> <li>8)  Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.</li> </ul>					
Application Papers					
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.					
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.					
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).					
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).					
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.					
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
<ul> <li>12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).</li> <li>a) All b) Some * c) None of:</li> <li>1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.</li> <li>2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No</li> <li>3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).</li> <li>* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.</li> </ul>					
Attachment(s)  1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 12/12/08, 9/27/05.  4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date  5) Notice of Informal Patent Application Other:					

Application/Control Number: 10/550,891 Page 2

Art Unit: 1792

## **DETAILED ACTION**

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claims 1-2, 4-9, and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hata (US 2002/0000424) in view of Kitano et al. (US 6,676,757).

Hata discloses a method for manufacturing a mask blank by depositing a film of resist liquid on a substrate by a spin coating process, and thereafter covering the surface of the substrate with a covering member and performing removal by dissolving an unnecessary part of the resist film by supplying a solvent from above the covering member during the rotation of the substrate and the covering member together so that the solvent is supplied to the periphery of the substrate. It is well known in the spin coating art that in the process of performing spinning to spread the coating to the outer periphery of the substrate, some drying of the applied liquid also occurs ("spin-drying"). Hata lacks a teaching of performing a reduced-pressure drying process for the spin-coated resist film prior to performing the unnecessary-film-removing process.

Kitano et al. similarly discloses a process for applying a resist film to a substrate and subsequently performing a coating film edge removal process at the outer periphery of the substrate (col. 11 and col. 12, lines 20-38). Kitano et al. also teaches the use of a reduced-pressure drying process, after coating of the resist film on the substrate and before the coating

Art Unit: 1792

film edge removal (col. 11, line 62 to col. 12, line 19). Kitano et al. teaches that improved results are achieved when using reduced pressure drying as opposed to drying on a heating plate, which is conventionally performed after a spin coating process and before edge removal. Kitano et al. teaches that a reduced pressure drying process can be performed quickly and a temperature of the coating film can be maintained uniform, as well as uniformity of film thickness is maintained since reduced pressure drying eliminates variations in the amount of volatilization in the film (col. 2, lines 14-35 and col. 3, lines 4-18). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art, having seen the references of Hata and Kitano et al. in combination, to have performed a reduced pressure drying process in the method of Hata prior to performed the edge unnecessary-film-removing process with the expectation of increased efficiency in the process and increased uniformity of coating thickness and temperature of the film. The test of obviousness is not express suggestion of the claimed invention in any or all references but rather what the references taken collectively would suggest to those of ordinary skill in the art presumed to be familiar with them. In re Rosselet, 347 F.2d 847, 146 USPQ 183 (CCPA 1965); *In re Hedges*, 783 F.2d 1038.

As to claim 2, Hata discloses the spin coating process in paragraph [0003]. While Hata does not specifically teach use of a cup having an opening on an upside, the Examiner takes Official notice that such a configuration for a spin coating cup is very well known in the spin coating art. It would have been obvious for one having ordinary skill in the art to have used an apparatus having an upper opening in the absence of a showing of criticality.

As to claim 4, Kitano et al. teaches use of a suction pipe 42b and suction pump 42c located at the topside of the cup in Figure 5. However it is the Examiner's position that it would

have been obvious to an engineer having ordinary skill in the art to have alternatively placed the pump and pipe at the downside of the cup with the expectation of similar results, as a matter of design preference, in the absence of a showing of criticality.

As to claim 5, it is the Examiner's position that the degree of vacuum is stepwise decreased in the process of Kitano et al. since the vacuum is turned on once the substrate is inside the container (col. 11, line 62 to col. 12, line 19). As to claim 9, it is noted that the substrate is stationary when the reduced pressure drying is performed.

As to claims 7-8, the difference between a maximum thickness and minimum thickness of the resist film in the process of Hata in view of Kitano et al. would necessarily be 50 angstroms or less after removing the peripheral resist film because the claimed process and that of Hata in view of Kitano et al. have similar materials and process steps. Additionally it is noted that the process of Hata in view of Kitano et al. would produce a uniform film as claimed in claim 8.

As to claim 11, Hata teaches that a baking process is performed after the edge removal in paragraph [0078].

3. Claims 3 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hata in view of Kitano et al. as applied to claims 1 and 6 above, and further in view of Okada (US 4,748,053).

Hata in view of Kitano et al. are applied as discussed above in section 2. The references lack a teaching of first applying the resist liquid at a first speed, and then spinning at a second, lower speed in the spin coating process. Okada is directed to a method of applying a resist film

Application/Control Number: 10/550,891 Page 5

Art Unit: 1792

on a square photo mask substrate. Okada teaches that a uniform film is achieved on the square substrate when spreading of the resist occurs by rotating at a first speed, followed by drying during the spreading step by rotating the substrate at a second speed slower than the first speed (abstract and col. 2, lines 11-26). It would have been obvious for one having ordinary skill in the art to have performed the spin coating/drying process at two separate speeds, a first higher speed followed by a second lower speed as taught by Okada, in the process of Hata in view of Kitano et al. with the expectation of improved uniformity of the resist liquid coating since Hata is similarly directed to application of a resist film on a square photomask substrate.

## Conclusion

4. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kirsten C. Jolley whose telephone number is 571-272-1421. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Tuesday and Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Timothy Meeks can be reached on 571-272-1423. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/550,891 Page 6

Art Unit: 1792

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Kirsten C Jolley/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1792

kcj